# Before the FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION Washington, D.C. 20554

)

)



In the Matter of

End User Common Line Charges

OCKET FILE COPY THISINAL

#### REPLY OF SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

Southwestern Bell Telephone Company (SWBT) submits its Reply in the captioned matter.

### I. <u>SOUTHWESTERN BELL FAVORS ONE SUBSCRIBER LINE CHARGE PER</u> SERVICE CONNECTION.

An overwhelming majority of commentors agree that (1) applying Subscriber Line Charges (SLCs) on a per-derived-channel basis is inequitable, and (2) a single SLC should be applied to such services. SWBT agrees. The current multiple-SLC policy artificially raises the price of ISDN and other derived channel services. The Commission should encourage, not discourage, the deployment of ISDN.

SWBT believes that the SLC should be applied on a per "service connection" basis, a policy similar to the Commission's "per facility" proposal, except that it does not tie SLC

Proprietary: Not for Use or Disclosure Outside the Southwestern Bell Corporation
Family of Companies Except Under Written Agreement

No. of Copies rec'd

BellSouth, pp. 3-4; Ameritech, p. 2; Bell Atlantic, p. 3; Bell South, pp. 4-5; Cincinnati, pp. 2-3; NTCA, p. 2; NYNEX, pp. 3-6; Rochester, pp. 2 & 4; Pacific, p. 4; Roseville Telephone, p. 2; Rural Telephone Association, p. 3; USTA, p. 2; Time Warner Communications, pp. 2-3; America Online, pp. 1-6; ITI, pp. 7-8; Microsoft Corporation, p. 4; Cable & Wireless, p. 2; MCI, p. 3; Sprint, pp. 3-4.

application to the physical provisioning of the service. Other companies have used similar terminology. SWBT agrees with Ameritech that application of SLC on a per "service interface," or as stated by SWBT, on a per "service connection" basis will avoid administrative problems associated with devising separate SLC rates to recover separate revenue requirements associated with different technologies.<sup>2</sup>

#### II. SLC APPLICATION SHOULD BE COMPETITIVELY NEUTRAL.

AT&T contends that SLCs should apply to PRI service on a per-derived-channel basis.<sup>3</sup> AT&T currently offers PRI services in direct competition with SWBT's PRI offerings. Requiring that SLC be applied on a per-derived-channel basis would force SWBT to charge up to an additional \$138.00 per month in SLC charges-charges which AT&T does not have to pass to its customers. AT&T thus seeks regulations which will confer price benefits upon AT&T. The Commission should reject AT&T's request.

## III. THE PROPOSED SLC APPLICATION CHANGE IS A RESTRUCTURE UNDER PRICE CAPS.

MCI contends that its proposal to charge one SLC per ISDN facility requires no change in the Commission's existing price cap rules to ensure that no increase in the CCL rate results from such

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ameritech, p. 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> AT&T's Comments, pp. 2-4.

a change. MCI states that under the existing rules, any change in SLC revenue requirements results in an equal change in the common line revenue requirement, and therefore the carrier common line revenue requirement remains the same. This interpretation is a mischaracterization of the price cap rules. The calculation of the CCL rate is not controlled by a carrier common line revenue requirement. As SWBT pointed out in its comments, a change in the application of SLCs can affect the SLC rate and revenue, as well as the measure of usage per line employed in the calculation of the "g" factor, which under the existing rules would affect the CCL rate. The Commission should reject MCI's interpretation of the rules and clarify that a change in SLC application is a restructure under the current rules. Therefore, a waiver of or change in the rules is required to ensure that no CCL rate changes occur as a result of a change in SLC application.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

The SLC should be applied on a service connection basis, and should be competitively neutral to all carriers.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> MCI, p. 4.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Id.

<sup>6</sup> SWBT, p. 4 and Exhibits 1, 2 and 3.

Respectfully submitted,

SOUTHWESTERN BELL TELEPHONE COMPANY

By

Robert M. Lynch Durward D. Dupre

J. Paul Walters, Jr.

Attorneys for Southwestern Bell Telephone Company

One Bell Center, Room 3520 St. Louis, Missouri 63101 (314) 235-2507

July 14, 1995

### CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, Katie M. Turner, hereby certify that the foregoing, "Reply Of Southwestern Bell Telephone Company," in Docket No. 95-72 has been filed this 14th day of July, 1995 to the Parties of Record.

Katie M. Turner

July 14, 1995

ITS INC 2100 M ST NW RM 140 WASHINGTON DC 20037 PEGGY REITZEL

POLICY AND PROGRAM PLANNING

DIVISION

COMMON CARRIER BUREAU

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
1919 M ST RM 544

WASHINGTON DC 20554

ROWLAND L CURRY
PUBLIC UTILITY COMMISSION OF
TEXAS
7800 SHOAL CREEK BLVD
AUSTIN TX 78757-1098

CHRISTOPHER BENNETT
ANALYST
MCI
1801 PENNSYLVANIA AVE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20006

STEVEN G SANDERS
NORTHERN ARKANSAS TELEPHONE
COMPANY
301 E MAIN ST
FLIPPIN AR 72634

CARESSA D BENNET
COUNSEL FOR
RURAL TELEPHONE COALITION
1831 ONTARIO PLACE NW STE 200
WASHINGTON DC 20009

WAYNE V BLACK ESQ C DOUGLAS JARRETT KELLER AND HECKMAN 1001 G ST NW STE 500W WASHINGTON DC 20001 STEPHEN E NEVAS ESQ NATIONAL PUBLIC RADIO INC 6Y35 MASSACHUSETTS AVE NW WASHINGTON DC 20001-3753

RANDOLPH J MAY
BRIAN T ASHBY
SUTHERLAND ASBILL & BRENNAN
COUNSEL FOR AMERICAN ONLINE
1275 PENNSYLVANIA AVE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20004-2404

MARK C ROSENBLUM
PETER H JACOBY
AT&T CORP
295 N MAPLE AVE RM 3244J1
BASKING RIDGE NJ 07920

LAWRENCE W KATZ
BELL ATLANTIC TELEPHONE
COMPANIES
1320 N COURT HOUSE RD
EIGHTH FL
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

M ROBERT SUTHERLAND RICHARD M SBARATTA BELLSOUTH TELECOMMUNICATIONS 4300 SOUTHERN BELL CENTER 675 WEST PEACHTREE ST NE ATLANTA, GA 30375

HENRY D LEVINE
ELLEN G BLOCK
LEVINE BLAZAK BLOCK &
BOOTHBY
1300 CONNECTICUT AVE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20036

CABLE & WIRELESS INC JEFFREY S LINDER 1776 K ST NW WASHINGTON DC 20006

MARK J O CONNOR
PIPER & MARBURY
THE COMMERCIAL INTERNET
EXCHANGE ASSOC
1200 19TH ST NW SEVENTH FL
WASHINGTON DC 20036

GAIL POLIVY GTE 1850 M ST NW STE 1200 WASHINGTON DC 20036

CHRISTOPHER J WILSON FROST & JACOBS COUNSEL FOR CINCINNATI BELL 2500 PNC CENTER 201 E FIFTH ST CINCINNATI OH 45202

MATTHEW O BRIEN
CMA PRESIDENT
SENIOR ANALYST
PRODIGY SERVICES CO
1201 MT KEMBLE AVE
MORRISTOWN NJ 07960-6628

JACK KRUMHOLTZ
LAW & CORPORATE AFFAIRS
DEPT
MICROSOFT CORP
5335 WISCONSIN AVE NW
SUITE 500
WASHINGTON DC 20015

EDWARD R WHOLL
NYNEX TELEPHONE COMPANIES
1300 I ST NW STE 400W
WASHINGTON DC 20005

TIMOTHY S DAWSON
PACIFIC BELL/NEVADA BELL
140 NEW MONTGOMERY ST RM 1523
SAN FRANCISOC CA 94105

MICHAEL J SHORTLEY III ROCHESTER TELEPHONE CORP 180 SOUTH CLINTON AVE ROCHESTER NY 14646

DANIEL J WEITZNER
THE CENTER FOR DEMOCRACY
AND TECHNOLOGY
1001 G ST NW STE 700E
WASHINGTON DC 20001

RHETT DAWSOBN
INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY
INDUSTRY COUNCIL
1250 EYE ST NW STE 200
WASHINGTON DC 20005

PAUL J FELDMAN
COUNSEL FOR ROSEVILLE
TELEPHONE COMPANY
FLETCHER HEALD & HILDRETH
1300 N 17TH ST 11TH FL
ROSSLYN VA 22209-3801

JAMES T HANNON
U S WEST COMMUNICATIONS INC
1020 19TH ST NW STE 700
WASHINGTON DC 20036

DAVID COSSON
NATIONAL TELEPHONE COOPERATIVE
ASSOCIATION
2626 PENNSYLVANIA AVE NW
WASHINGTON DC 20037

JAY C KEITHLEY
SPRINT CORPORATION
1850 M ST NW 11TH FL
WASHINGTON DC 20036

JEANNE MORAN
GENERAL COUNSEL
TENNESSEE PUBLIC SERVICE
COMMISSION
460 JAMES ROBERTSON PKWY
NASHVILLE TN 37243

R MICHAEL SENKOWSKI
JEFFREY S LINDER
WILEY REIN & FIELDING
COUNSEL FOR TELECOMMUNIATIONS ASSOC
1776 K ST NW
WASHINGTON DC 20006

DAVID R POE
LEBOEUF LAMB GREENE &
MACRAE LLP
1875 CONNECTICUT AVE NW
SUITE 1200
WASHINGTON DC 20009

MICHAEL S PABIAN

AMERITECH

2000 W AMERITECH CTR DR

RM 4H82

HOFFMAN ESTATES IL 60196-1025

MARY MCDERMOTT
USTA
1401 H ST NW STE 600
WASHINGTON DC 20005